



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

league. It seemed to be a fixed idea in the minds of many people that continental Europe was threatened by a great danger, the danger of an alliance between America and England. Well, I do not mind telling you in confidence that no such alliance exists or is contemplated. The United States are quite strong enough to take care of themselves, and so assuredly is the British empire.

"It has been generally believed on this side of the water, and not without reason, that at the time of the Revolution England was the bitter enemy of America. Trevelyan in his history of the American Revolution shows that the war was regarded as a civil war, and was thoroughly unpopular. Whatever might be thought of the arguments by which the government upheld its right to tax the colonists,—and on that matter there was room for differences of opinion,—the English people did not wish to enforce the claim by war. Among English statesmen of that period, the first three names were those of Pitt, Fox and Burke. All three opposed the war to the utmost.

"The employment of foreigners against the American colonists was fiercely and naturally resented. Yet the reason for it was that the King could not get Englishmen to enlist for service against those whom they regarded as their own people.

"Do not suppose that all this backwardness on the part of the English people was due to want of spirit or patriotism. It was due, as Lord Shelburne pointed out at the time, to the fact that they refused to regard the war as a foreign war.

"Not only was the Revolutionary War unpopular in England, but its results in England were wholly different from its results in America. It was fought on American soil, and moreover it was to Americans the great event of their past, the very foundation of their national existence. To the English people it was only one incident in their long island story, and as a nation they had suffered little from a war waged three thousand miles away from their homes. It left no bitterness behind. I like to believe that even in America the bitterness which it left behind has been to some extent exaggerated. It is true that in 1812, toward the close of the long struggle with Napoleon, the United States threw their weight into the scale against England, and there was once more some rough fighting by land and sea between Englishmen and Americans. But the War of 1812 did not command universal approval in America.

"To the north of the United States there has been slowly growing up all that time under the British flag, to which it had held fast in weal and woe, a nation which promises to be one day among the greatest nations of the earth. Her frontier now marches with that of the United States for three thousand miles. What do we see on that long border line? Is the frontier guarded to north and south by great fortresses bristling with cannon and manned by garrisons ready at any moment to repel a sudden attack? Along the whole extent of the line hardly an armed man is to be seen. On either side is a peaceful population, living in no dread of its neighbor. The reason must surely be that, in spite of occasional disputes, amounting at times to dangerous tension, the people of the two nations have never entertained for one another any feeling of real hostility.

"I can only say again that there is nothing but good will in England toward the United States. There is something more even than goodwill. There is a feeling of kinship and of pride in our kinship. [Loud applause.] We are proud first of the British flag and of the free nations that gather around it. Their interests are our interests, and their people are our people. But we are proud, too, not envious, of this great country — proud, heartily proud, of the stars and stripes. [Prolonged cheering, everybody standing to applaud.]"

Autumnal Meetings of the British Peace Society.

The autumnal meetings of the British Peace Society were held at Bristol, Bath and Weston-super-mare on the 8th, 9th and 10th of October. The afternoon Conference at Bristol was presided over by the Dean of Bristol. The speakers were Canon Tetley, Rev. H. B. Bromley, Dr. W. Evans Darby and others.

The Dean declared that to secure universal peace they must go to the root of the matter and inculcate peace principles in the young. Canon Tetley felt that they must get down to bed-rock and cultivate the temper of peace, and do away with that insolence which is provocative of so much mischief.

Dr. Darby, after alluding to the dangers of conscription, and the method alone in which justice between nations can be secured, directed his remarks chiefly to the fallacy that preparation for war is the best method of assuring peace. "No man would fill his house with gunpowder to guard against explosion."

An interesting colloquy took place between the Dean and Dr. Darby as to the necessity of compelling submission to arbitral decisions if arbitration was to be of any real service, the Dean inclining to the compulsory view, and Dr. Darby radically opposing it.

The evening meeting was presided over by Mr. Joseph Storrs Fry, head of the great Fry Cocoa Works. The speakers were Rabbi Joshua Abelson, Rev. R. Cynon Lewis and others. Mr. Fry urged that if they looked at war in the pure light of reason and Christianity they must arrive at the conclusion that war is absolutely wrong, not only actual war, but preparation for it, and the spirit of it. All the advantages were on the side of peace: all the disadvantages on the side of war. It was a false view that the world is governed by physical force. In the last analysis, the affairs of the world are decided by the forces which are greater than physical force.

Rev. R. C. Lewis introduced a resolution and spoke against rifle shooting in the schools. People who thought imperially were apt, he said, to act imperiously. He pleaded for economy, the sanctity of human life, for the highest and noblest brotherhood, "according to the Book itself."

Rabbi Abelson read an interesting paper on "The Blessing of Peace — A Jewish Ideal." A war-loving Jew, he said, was a contradiction of terms, as the corner stone of rabbinical ethics was love.

Dr. Darby then, on request, gave an account of the Milan Peace Congress and the Berlin Conference of the International Law Association. "These meetings," he said, "represented marvelous progress in the sentiment of Europe on the question of peace." He was specially

impressed with the development of the movement in Germany, which was now covered with a network of peace organizations.

The meetings at Bath on the 9th and at Weston-super-mare on the 10th were well attended and interesting. The former was presided over by T. B. Silcock, M. P., who deplored the enormous increase of the army and navy expenses in recent years, and the prevalence of false ideals of national greatness. But a change had come and the eyes of the nation were once more, he was glad to say, turned in the direction of peace, and he hoped that Great Britain would lead the way in the greatest of all reforms, the promotion of a peaceful policy between the nations of the earth.

G. P. Gooch, M. P., declared that war, though it had prevailed in the past, was not a necessary factor in human progress, but would be discarded as many other evils which had disgraced the past history of humanity had been. He deplored the periodic outbursts of bellicose passion, against which the peace workers found it difficult to contend successfully. But he was sure that the higher sense of mankind was steadily asserting itself, and that the new factors in internationalism would render the danger of war less and less.

At the Weston-super-mare meeting the speakers were Mr. J. H. Cox, who presided, T. B. Silcock, M. P., who was given great applause, and who emphasized the superior power of religious and spiritual ideals in working out the welfare and the peace of the world, Rev. Leonard Dalby, and Dr. W. Evans Darby.

The *Herald of Peace* reports that, in spite of bad weather, "the meetings were a marked success both in point of attendance, general interest, speaking, and notice by the press."

War and the Spirit of Democracy.

BY REV. CHARLES F. DOLE.
From "*The Spirit of Democracy*."*

War, like crime or disease, is an anomaly in modern civilization. Here is the world-wide difference between the theories of ancient and of modern life. In ancient life war was a habitual part of the business of the nation. The regular work of the government was to be ready to slay men. The old habit was to look on foreign peoples as natural enemies. The democratic habit is to see natural friends in all nations. This is the underlying thought of our democracy. Whereas the governments in the old times actually kept on hand the war-engendering microbes of hate, jealousy, envy, suspicion, inhumanity, and war therefore always threatened to break out, like the plague in Bombay, it is the first duty of a modern state to get rid of these evil microbes. The great objection to the support of a huge military and naval establishment is not the cost nor the immediate peril of our liberties, but the established fact that the subtle germs of war—pride, antagonism, arrogance, jealousy,—thrive in the substance of a great war department as the bacilli of consumption thrive and multiply in a deposit of abnormal animal tissues.

Let us frankly consider certain varieties of possible war, with reference, not to imaginary problems or to the issues of earlier times, but to the actual conditions which

we see in our world of to-day. We may rule out altogether, so far as we in the United States are concerned, the necessity of war with a superior power, as, for example, for the defense of liberty. . . .

Moreover we have passed, we hope forever, though at vast cost, upon the problem of revolutionary secession from our union of states. No one fears civil war. Or, if bitter voices are sometimes raised in prediction of some coming crisis of industrial revolution, we ought by this time to know the one way certain to avert the approach of mischief; namely, to do justice in public and private, to develop a more generous humanity, and to foster the growth of the democratic spirit. There is in fact no subject, as there was in the days of slavery, which threatens seriously to afford the material of civil war. . . .

We have mainly to consider what possibility of righteous war there is with other equal and sovereign nations. Let us count upon the fingers of one hand all the nations with which the United States is likely to have any pretext for a bloody quarrel.

First of these nations is England, our own mother country. Through her colonial possessions, she is our nearest neighbor. For the width of the continent her Canadian border marches with ours. We have no better or more friendly neighbor. Our laws, institutions and customs are with slight differences substantially the same. Our people generally profess forms of the same religion. A thousand international links bind us more closely every day. For any thoughtful and humane mind war with England is too terrible and preposterous to contemplate. It would be the straight and almost contemptuous denial of the Christianity of a hundred thousand churches.

For what national interest could war with England be entered upon? Not for any possible pecuniary gain to either nation. Not for the acquisition of territory. There is not even the slightest boundary question anywhere in sight. There is no piece of land upon the earth whose lawful sovereignty stands in doubt that is worth fighting about for either nation. The vast mercantile and industrial interests of both nations are overwhelmingly against war. The sympathies of the great mass of the plain people of both nations are equally against it.

Must we then consider the possibility of war with England over some fancied insult or question of national honor? It is certain that the representative men of both nations have no slightest disposition to insult or prejudice or injure the people of the other nation. There has been immense gain in this respect in fifty years on both sides of the ocean. What now is national honor? It is not honor to be hunting for imaginary insult. It is not honor to look on one's neighbors with suspicion. It is not honor, worthy of civilized men, to be quick to take up arms and to fight and kill. Revenge is not honor. Is it not rather national honor to be humane and friendly? Is it not the part of the strong nation, as of the strong man, to keep a cool temper, to give and to expect justice, to maintain sturdy goodwill to all? . . .

Can we discover any reason for the apprehension of war with the republic of France? Here is a nation with which we have always had a tradition of friendship. An immense trade connects the two countries. Hosts of

*"*The Spirit of Democracy*," by Charles F. Dole. New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co.